



RECEIVED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
MAY 27 2008

MAY 27 2008

CLERK'S OFFICE  
HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY  
MAY 21, 2008

USDC SDNY	
DOCUMENT	
ATTORNEYS AT LAW	
321 NORTH CLARK STREET, SUITE 2800	
DOC #	CHICAGO, IL 60610-4764
312.832.4500 TEL	312.832.4509 FAX
DATE FILED: 5/29/08	
foley.com	

WRITER'S DIRECT LINE  
312.832.4557  
jlee@foley.com EMAIL

CLIENT/MATTER NUMBER  
084965-0101

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Hon. William H. Pauley  
United States District Judge  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl St., Room 2210  
New York, NY 10007

**MEMO ENDORSED** Application granted.  
SO ORDERED:

*William H. Pauley*  
WILLIAM H. PAULEY III U.S.D.J.  
5/27/08

**Re: The Langston Law Firm, PA et al. v. The State of Mississippi et al.; 08-C-04331**

Dear Judge Pauley:

Pursuant to your standing order 1.E regarding requests for an extension of time, I am writing to request an extension of time for the filing of the initial opening brief of my client, The Langston Law Firm, PA, Joseph C. Langston, and Timothy R. Balducci, the appellants in the above named case (the "Appellants"), as well as corresponding extensions of time on the appellees' subsequent response brief and the appellants' reply brief. Specifically, the Appellants request that the Court extend the due date for their opening brief until June 13, 2008, the response brief until July 18, 2008, and the reply brief until August 8, 2008. There have been no previous requests for extensions of time.

The above-captioned matter was docketed on appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court on May 8, 2008. Under Rule 8009(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, the Appellants are granted 15 days to file their opening brief, the appellees are granted 15 days to file their response, and the Appellants are granted 10 days to file their reply. Thus, in the instant matter, the Appellants' opening brief is currently due on Friday, May 23, 2008.

The Appellants request that the Court grant them additional time to prepare their opening brief, as counsel for Appellants will not have sufficient time to prepare the opening brief by May 23, 2008. This matter involves several legal issues that will generate significant briefing. In addition, I am currently preparing for a criminal evidentiary hearing that is set for June 2, 2008. Because I could not predict when the case would be docketed—triggering the due dates under Rule 8009(a)—I was unable to schedule my evidentiary hearing around the applicable deadlines in advance. I believe that the proposed deadlines, as set forth in the proposed scheduling order attached hereto as Exhibit A, will provide both parties with sufficient time to prepare their briefs in light of other commitments and the complexity of the case.

Counsel for the Appellees have indicated that they have no objection to the proposed briefing schedule.

BOSTON  
BRUSSELS  
CENTURY CITY  
CHICAGO  
DETROIT

JACKSONVILLE  
LOS ANGELES  
MADISON  
MIAMI  
MILWAUKEE

NEW YORK  
ORLANDO  
SACRAMENTO  
SAN DIEGO  
SAN DIEGO/DEL MAR

SAN FRANCISCO  
SHANGHAI  
SILICON VALLEY  
TALLAHASSEE  
TAMPA

TOKYO  
WASHINGTON, D.C.



FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Hon. William H. Pauley  
May 21, 2008  
Page 2

Sincerely,

  
A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "JmL".

Joanne Lee, Esq.

JL:lap  
Attachments

cc: Andrew M. Kramer, Esq.  
Michael P. Richman, Esq.  
Geoffrey Goodman, Esq.